



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,973	09/24/2003	Takashi Yano	240117US-2 CONT	1462
22850	7590	02/13/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ALI, MOHAMMAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/668,973	Applicant(s) YANO ET AL	
	Examiner Mohammad Ali	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9, 11-22 and 24-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9, 11-22 and 24-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/22/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the arguments filed on 1/22/05.

The application has been examined and claims 2-9, 11-22 and 24-34 are pending in this Office Action. Claims 32-34 have been added as new.

Response to Arguments

2. After further search and a thorough examination of the present application claims 2-9, 11-22 and 24-34 remain rejected.

Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 2-9, 11-22 and 24-34 have been considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

First, In response to applicant's argument on pages 8 and 10, *a prima facie case of obviousness* is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973).

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2166

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

"[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the examiner to focus on the limitations that are "crux of the invention" and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of

Art Unit: 2166

ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

"Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art."

In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" *Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc.* U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, - 1181

"[q]uestion is whether there is something in prior art as whole to suggest desirability, and thus obviousness, of making combination." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al.* U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 221 USPQ 481 Decided Mar. 21, 1984 No 83-1178.

Second, Applicant's argue that Kamper and Evans do not teach 'displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on the search result'.

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Kamper teaches this limitation as, Kamper and Evans teaches 'displaying,

Art Unit: 2166

on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on the content of the search result' as, various pop-up menus are optionally displayed to the user during the search formulation and/or re-formulation to provide proactive assistance to the user. After the highlight tool has been activated a decision block and a test is made to determine whether the highlight tool has been placed over a selectable object (e.g., some text in the document being displayed). If the outcome "result" of the test is negative, the routine branches to optionally cause a pop-up "help" menu or screen to be displayed to guide the user to take some action. The menu includes such text as "please highlight text that you would like to search" or the like. If the outcome "result" of the test is positive, then the routine continues. The method then optionally display an additional "help" screen if needed (e.g., after a predetermined time delay). This screen say "you have placed the highlight tool; do you want to initiate a search" or the like. A test is made to determine whether an object (e.g., a search comprising a word or words) has been selected. If the outcome "result" of the test is negative, the routine cycles back as indicated. The outcome "result" of the test is positive, the routine continues to test whether the selection is complete. If not, the routine cycles back as indicated. The outcome of the test is positive, the routine continues (see col. 7, lines 39-65, Fig. 6, Kamper). Also, (once the search term is marked "content" by the highlighting tool and the user releases the mouse button, a pop-up menu is optionally displayed to guide the user through subsequent navigation steps. FIG. 5c illustrates one possible form of this pop-up menu. A toolbar is used in place of the pop-up menu. The menu includes a number of options including: "search for the phrase," "search for all words," and search

for "any of the selected terms." Preferably, one of the options is a "default." The pop-up menu is displayed after a predetermined time delay (e.g., 1-3 seconds). The pop-up menu provides significant navigational assistance to inexperienced users, see col. 6, lines 50-65, Kamper) Therefore, applicant's claimed displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content of the search result is same as Kamper's teaching (see col. 7, lines 39-65, Fig. 6, Kamper).

Third, Applicant's argue that Kamper and fails to disclose 'the content of the search result has anything to do with the pop-up menus'.

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Kamper teaches this limitation as stated above.

Hence, Applicants' arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 2166

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 2-9, 11-22 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert J. Kamper ('kamper', hereinafter), US Patent 5,982,370 in view of Evans et al., ('Evans', hereinafter), US Patent 5,926,808.

With respect to claim 2,

Kamper discloses a method of managing information (see Abstract, lines 4-9), comprising:

identifying a word of an image as a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

determining a search result corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper);

displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content (once the search term is marked "content" by the highlighting tool and the user releases the mouse button, a pop-up menu is optionally displayed to guide the user through subsequent navigation steps. FIG. 5c illustrates one possible form of this pop-up menu. A toolbar is used in place of the pop-up menu. The menu includes a number of options

including: "search for the phrase," "search for all words," and search for "any of the selected terms." Preferably, one of the options is a "default." The pop-up menu is displayed after a predetermined time delay (e.g., 1-3 seconds). The pop-up menu provides significant navigational assistance to inexperienced users, see col. 6, lines 50-65, Kamper) of the search result (col. 10, lines 26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65);

displaying information corresponding to the search result (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper); and

displaying additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "keyword displayed image".

Evans discloses the claimed keyword displayed image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1, lines 39-43, Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because keyword displayed image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be able immediately shown related text from another document as suggested by Evans, see col. 1, lines 39-43). Keyword displayed image as taught by Evans improves to

Art Unit: 2166

display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

As to claim 3,

Kamper teaches wherein the image is displayed on a display unit (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 4,

Kamper teaches wherein the information corresponding to the search result is displayed on a display unit (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 5,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of displaying additional information is performed without altering a file corresponding to the image (col. 10, lines 26-37 et seq).

As to claim 6,

Kamper teaches selecting, after the step of displaying information and before the step of displaying additional information, the portion of the displayed information (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 7,

Kamper teaches wherein the determining step comprises: determining the search result using a search engine accessible by a browser (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 8,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of identifying a word is performed using a pointing device (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 9,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of identifying a word is performed using a cursor position (col. 10, lines 3-4).

As to claim 11,

Kamper teaches wherein the identified word is a non-linked word (col. 10, lines 26-37).

As to claim 12,

Kamper teaches wherein, when a file is displayed on a display unit, a word from the file is identified as the keyword specified by a cursor on the display unit (col. 10, lines 3-4).

As to claim 13,

Kamper teaches displaying, on a display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu comprising menu items for specifying search criteria for a search engine (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper); and

specifying the menu item by a cursor, wherein the keyword and the menu items specified are input into the search engine (col. 10, lines 3-4).

As to claim 14,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying at least one search database (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 15,

Kamper teaches displaying, on a display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu for specifying output criteria of the search result (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 16,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying where to output the search result (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

With respect to claim 17,

Kamper discloses an information management device (see Abstract, lines 4-9), comprising:

a display unit configured to display an image (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

an identification unit configured to identify a word displayed in the image to be a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper); and

a search unit configured to input the keyword and to output a search result

corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper), wherein the display unit is configured to obtain the search result corresponding to the keyword from the search unit (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper), to displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content (once the search term is marked "content" by the highlighting tool and the user releases the mouse button, a pop-up menu is optionally displayed to guide the user through subsequent navigation steps. FIG. 5c illustrates one possible form of this pop-up menu. A toolbar is used in place of the pop-up menu. The menu includes a number of options including: "search for the phrase," "search for all words," and search for "any of the selected terms." Preferably, one of the options is a "default." The pop-up menu is displayed after a predetermined time delay (e.g., 1-3 seconds). The pop-up menu provides significant navigational assistance to inexperienced users, see col. 6, lines 50-65, Kamper) of the search result (col. 10, lines

26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65), to display information corresponding to the search result, and to display additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "word displayed in an image".

Evans discloses the claimed word displayed in an image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1, lines 39-43, Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because word displayed in an image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be able immediately shown related text from another document as suggested by Evans, see col. 1, lines 39-43). Word displayed in an image as taught by Evans improves to display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

As to claim 18,

Kamper teaches a selection unit configured to receive an input from a user who selects a portion of the displayed information; and at least one database for storing therein at least one file (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 19,

Art Unit: 2166

Kamper teaches wherein said search unit is a search engine accessible by a browser (see col. 3, lines 16-23 et seq, Kamper).

As to claim 20,

Kamper teaches wherein the identification unit is configured to identify the word using a pointing device (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 21,

Kamper teaches wherein the identification unit is configured to identify the word using a cursor position (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 22,

Kamper teaches wherein the display unit is configured to display additional information without altering a file corresponding to the image on the display unit (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 24,

Kamper teaches wherein the identification unit is configured to identify a non-linked word (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 25,

Kamper teaches when a file comprising a hypertext file or a non-hypertext file is displayed on the display unit, the identification unit is configured to identify a word from the file as the keyword specified by the cursor (col. 10, lines 3-4) on the display unit (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 26,

Kamper teaches a search criteria specification unit configured to display, on the display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu for specifying search criteria for the search unit, the menu comprising menu items to be specified by a (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper); and

a transfer unit configured to transfer the keyword and the menu items specified to the search unit (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 27,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying at least one search database (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

As to claim 28,

Kamper teaches an output criteria specification unit configured to display, on the display unit, in a space adjacent to the keyword, a menu for specifying output criteria of the search result (see col. 3, lines 38-43, kamper).

As to claim 29,

Kamper teaches wherein the menu is for specifying where to output the result of the search (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper).

With respect to claim 30,

Kamper discloses an information management device (see Abstract, lines 4-9), comprising:

means for displaying an image (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

means for identifying a word displayed in the image to be a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

Art Unit: 2166

means for determining a search result corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper);

means for displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content (once the search term is marked "content" by the highlighting tool and the user releases the mouse button, a pop-up menu is optionally displayed to guide the user through subsequent navigation steps. FIG. 5c illustrates one possible form of this pop-up menu. A toolbar is used in place of the pop-up menu. The menu includes a number of options including: "search for the phrase," "search for all words," and search for "any of the selected terms." Preferably, one of the options is a "default." The pop-up menu is displayed after a predetermined time delay (e.g., 1-3 seconds). The pop-up menu provides significant navigational assistance to inexperienced users, see col. 6, lines 50-65, Kamper) of the search result (col. 10, lines 26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65);

means for displaying information corresponding to the search result (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper); and

means for displaying additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "word displayed in an image".

Evans discloses the claimed word displayed in an image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1, lines 39-43, Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because word displayed in an image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be able immediately shown related text from another document as suggested by Evans, see col. 1, lines 39-43). Word displayed in an image as taught by Evans improves to display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

With respect to claim 31,

Kamper discloses a computer program product storing program instructions for execution on a computer device, which when executed by the computer device, cause the computer device to perform (see Abstract, lines 4-9) the steps of:

identifying a word displayed in an image to be a keyword (see col. 3, lines 16-23, Kamper);

determining a search result corresponding to the keyword (see col. 3, lines 35-43, Kamper);

displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content (once the search term is marked "content" by the highlighting tool and the user releases the mouse button, a pop-up menu is optionally displayed to guide the user through subsequent navigation steps. FIG. 5c illustrates one possible form of this pop-up menu. A toolbar is used in place of the pop-up menu. The menu includes a number of options including: "search for the phrase," "search for all words," and search for "any of the

Art Unit: 2166

selected terms." Preferably, one of the options is a "default." The pop-up menu is displayed after a predetermined time delay (e.g., 1-3 seconds). The pop-up menu provides significant navigational assistance to inexperienced users, see col. 6, lines 50-65, Kamper) of the search result (col. 10, lines 26-37 and col. 7, lines 39-65);

displaying information corresponding to the search result (see col. 3, lines 42-43, Kamper); and

displaying additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information (see col. 3, lines 34-37).

Kamper does not explicitly indicate the claimed "keyword displayed image".

Evans discloses the claimed keyword displayed image (Hyperlinks operate on a page image shown to a database user. A phrase or text section on the page image will be highlighted. When a user selects this phrase clicking on the mouse, the user immediately shown the related text from another document, see col. 1, lines 39-43, Evans).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because keyword displayed image of Evans's teachings would have allowed Kamper's system to select a phrase or text from the page image by clicking with a mouse will be able immediately shown related text from another document as suggested by Evans, see col. 1, lines 39-43). Keyword displayed image as taught by Evans improves to display portions of text from multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query (see col. 2, lines 36-37 et seq, Evans).

As to claim 32,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of displaying the pop-up menu comprises: displaying text corresponding to the search result ms text in the pop-up menu (see col. 7, lines 39-65, Fig. 6, Kamper).

As to claim 33,

Kamper teaches wherein the step of displaying the pop-up menu (see col. 7, lines 39-65, Fig. 6, Kamper) comprises: determining text to be displayed in the pop-up menu, wherein the text corresponds to documents searched in obtaining the search result (see col. 7, lines 39-65, Fig. 6, Kamper).

As to claim 34,

Kamper teaches wherein text displayed in the pop-up menu varies according to the content of the search result (see col. 7, lines 39-65, Fig. 6, and see col. 6, lines 50-65, Kamper)).

Remarks

5. US Patent 5,977,972 (Bates et al.) and US Patent 6,601,507 (Underwood et al.) also teaches Pop-up menu including other limitations.

IDS filed on 11/22/05 (05-189488, 09-044525, 05-128157) also teaches including claims limitations pop-up menu.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2166


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

MA
February 6, 2006